

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action of June 16, 2004. Claims 1-53 were presented for examination and were rejected. Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 14, 20, 24, 26, 30, 34, 38, 43, 48, and 49 are independent claims. Claims 14, 20, 24, 26, 30, and 34 are amended. No claims are added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-53 remain pending.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 12-14, 20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being un-patentable over DEKONING et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,337); rejected claims 26, 28-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-46, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being un-patentable over COSSINS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,290); rejected claims 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over WATSON et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,784) in view of DEKONING et al.; rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as un-patentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BASS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,185); rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as un-patentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BASS et al., and further in view of DOOLAN (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,955); rejected claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of DOOLAN; rejected claims 17, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as un-patentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BRANTON, JR. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,336); rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as un-patentable over DEKONING et al. in view of COSSINS et al.; rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as un-patentable over DEKONING et al. in view of COSSINS et al., and further in view of BRANTON, JR. et al.; rejected claims 27, 31, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as un-patentable over COSSINS et al. in view of SITARAMAN et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,170); rejected

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

claims 42, 47, 49, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as un-patentable over COSSINS et al. in view of EICK et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,212); and rejected claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as un-patentable over COSSINS et al. in view of EICK et al., and further in view of DEKONING et al. To facilitate readability, all "et al" designations shall be dropped in the remaining portion of this response.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 12-14, 20, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being un-patentable over DEKONING. The purposes of DEKONING and Applicants' claims are oriented in very different directions. Referring to Fig. 1 of DEKONING, its purpose is to reduce network traffic between RAID subsystems (14, 16, 18) connected to a system bus (20) and a controller (22) located in a client (12) also connected to that system bus. It accomplishes this traffic reduction by using a cache memory (26) located in the client into which objects are stored which are retrieved from one of the RAID subsystems to be managed, and by using any one or more of those cached objects if they should also be resident in other RAID subsystems to be managed, rather than obtain those objects from the other RAID subsystems. This avoids the redundancy of obtaining those identical (cache-resident) objects from the other RAID subsystems over the bus, and consequently reduces traffic over the bus. *See, e.g., Abstract and column 1, line 56 to column 2, line 4.*

By contrast, a purpose of Applicants' claimed subject matter, as expressed throughout their specification, is at least to provide a GUI display of lists of events that occurred in the network, to enable a human operator to interact with the GUI to manage these events. These events include network degradations, failures, faults, alarms, ranging

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

from minor alarms to major and critical alarms including fires, and other events and incidents occurring throughout the network. Clearly, DEKONING's purpose and Applicants' purpose are quite different.

Consider Claim 1, for example, which recites a method for managing a network. The method includes providing a first list of *events* occurring in the network to a graphical user interface; simultaneously providing a second list of *events* occurring in the network to the graphical user interface, where the second list comprises a predetermined number of most recent *events*; and managing the network using the first and second lists. The subject matter of claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by DEKONING because it does not disclose or suggest providing a first list of *events* occurring in the network to a graphical user interface and simultaneously providing a second list of *events* occurring in the network to the graphical user interface, where the second list of *events* comprises a predetermined number of most recent *events*, as required by claim 1. The Examiner relied on col. 5, lines 24-31 of DEKONING for allegedly disclosing the providing of a first list and on col. 3, lines 13-15, and col. 6, lines 1-8, of DEKONING for allegedly disclosing the providing of a second list (Office Action, pg. 2). However, the lists to which the Examiner refers in DEKONING are lists of management-related objects which are not lists of events as disclosed by Applicants, and furthermore those lists are not provided simultaneously.

In Applicants' specification, referring to Figs. 3A and 3B:

"As illustrated, database 310 includes a group of entries 305 that relate to *events* that occurred in the network 110. Each entry 305 may include information stored in one [or] more of the following exemplary fields: an

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

alarm type field 311, an optional number field 312, a state field 313, and action field 314, a time field 315, a date field 316, a network element (NE) identifier (ID) field 317, and an alarm description field 318." (page 8, line 20 through page 9 line 4; emphasis added)

"Database 330 (FIG 3B) may include a group of entries 325 that relate to events that occurred in the network 110. Each entry may include information stored in one or more of the following exemplary fields: a network element field 331, an ID field 332, an alarms field 333, a tickets (TT) field 334, a held alarms (HA) field 335, a notes field 336, an incidents (IN) field 337, a users field 338, an escalate alarm field 339, and a last modified field 340." (page 11, lines 1-6, emphasis added)

Thus, in Applicants' specification, events occur in the network. These are manifestations or occurrences of problems, failures, faults (i.e., alarms) in the network, and these events relate to the data of databases 310 and 330. The lists in Applicants' specification and claims are lists of events - i.e., lists of incidents that happened in the network.

By contrast, the lists in DEKONING are lists of objects in the network needed to manage the system. In column 5, lines 24-31, a section to which the Office Action (page 2) also refers, it states: "A list is then acquired that identifies the objects stored within the subject subsystem that are required for managing the subsystem." (emphasis added)

DEKONING discusses its objects at length in column 4, line 1 to column 6 line 51. Throughout that section of the disclosure, various kinds of objects are discussed. For example, certain objects are representative of components of the subsystems such as disk drives, controllers, power supplies, fans, etc., which is also stated, for example, in the preamble of claim 1 in DEKONING. And, there are certain kinds of objects that are likely to be redundant and which are, therefore, likely to be stored in the cache of DEKONING:

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

“Because some of the physical and logical entities are the same in different subsystems, the associated objects stored in the subsystems are the same. Thus, in accordance with the present invention, the cache memory 26 in the client machine 12 is used for storing objects previously retrieved from one of the subsystems 14-18 for future use in association with other of the subsystems 14-18.

Because the objects are stored locally within the client machine 112, these objects do not have to be transferred over the network medium 20 later when they are needed to manage the other subsystems.” (column 4, line 60 to column 5 line 1)

Thus, the objects associated with these physical and logical entities are objects on DEKONING’s list of objects which are likely to be cached, because they are redundant objects from subsystem to subsystem and are objects needed to manage the system. It is thus clear that the objects in DEKONING are not equivalent to Applicants’ failure events whereby DEKONING’s list of objects does not disclose or suggest “providing a first list of events” and “simultaneously providing a second list of events” as recited in Applicants’ claim 1.

Moreover, assuming, *arguendo*, that DEKONING’s objects are equivalent to Applicant’s failure events (which they plainly are not), the two lists in DEKONING are *not obtained simultaneously*. In column 7, lines 23 to 51, operation of DEKONING is presented where a list for the first subsystem and a list for the second subsystem are discussed. The cache is assumed to be initially empty. A list of objects is obtained from the first subsystem, and the controller then obtains all of the objects on that list from the first subsystem which are then stored in the cache. Then it states: “The user now indicates that he wishes to manage the second subsystem. The controller 22 acquires the

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

list for the second subsystem and compare it to the objects stored in the cache memory 20." (emphasis added) It is thus clear that the second list is obtained *after* the first list is obtained, and thus they are not obtained simultaneously, as recited in claim 1.

In view of the above, it is submitted that DEKONING does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claim 1, and it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-5 depend from allowable claim 1 and are also allowable, at least for reasons based on their direct or indirect dependency from allowable claim 1.

Claims 6 and 12-13 recite similar limitations to those of claim 1 and claims 14, 20 and 24 have been amended to recite similar limitations to those of claim 1. The amendments made to claims 14, 20 and 24 are supported throughout the specification as filed. For example, as disclosed on page 10 lines 11-20, the interaction between trouble information matrix 600 and active alarm interface 500 is disclosed. Applicants submit that DEKONING does not disclose or suggest claims 6, 12-14, 20, and 24 for reasons given above, and it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of these claims be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The Examiner rejected claims 26, 28-30, 32-34, 36-41, 43-46, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being un-patentable over COSSINS. The Office Action, page 5, indicates that "Cossins teaches selecting network elements to "drill down" to enable viewing more detailed information (See Cossins, col. 9, line 59-col 10, line 34)". This section of COSSINS says, in part:

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

“.....“to drill down”, i.e. to navigate to another screen or to display another portion of a screen having other information for the selected network element or data. For example, a user may select a cell site on a display to see the status of the cell site.” (column 9, lines 61-65)

This says that another screen can be displayed or a site can be selected and expanded.

There are several references to “zoom” or “zooming” in COSSINS, such as in Fig. 8 and other places. For example:

“For example, the GNMS 104B may be configured to generate a new map in which the selected cell 208 is centered in the map. A *zoom* may be effected, thereby generating a new map. (column 17, lines 1-4, emphasis added)

It is clear from these passages that a normal zooming function is being described, where the map is merely expanded in size so that certain detail becomes more visible. This does not disclose or suggest Applicants' amended claims.

For example, Claim 26 recites *inter alia*:

“managing the network using the geographical map, the managing including detecting selection of a network device in the plurality of network devices and providing to the graphical user interface a more detailed view of a geographical area around the selected network device in response to the detecting *while simultaneously maintaining at least a portion of the geographical map visible on the graphical user interface without changing the size of the portion of the geographical map.*”  
(emphasis added)

Thus, the method being claimed by Applicants has the capability of displaying a geographical map on a graphical user interface, and then expanding a portion of that map to provide detail surrounding a selected network device, but at the same time displaying the original geographical map and keeping the size or dimensional scale of the geographical map unchanged. This is plainly visible in, and supported at least by, Fig. 7

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

which is another exemplary graphical user interface consistent with the present invention. This limitation is not disclosed or suggested by COSSINS which only discusses an expansion (zoom) of the view, at best. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

The same or similar limitation is recited in independent claims 30 and 34 wherefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of these claims should be withdrawn and the claims allowed for the reasons given above.

Dependent claims 27-29, 31-33, and 35-37 are dependent respectively from allowable claims 26, 30, and 34, and each of these dependent claims are likewise allowable, at least for reasons based on its dependency from an allowable independent claim.

Independent claim 38 recites a device for managing a network having a plurality of network elements. The device includes a memory configured to store instructions and a processor configured to execute the instructions to associate each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes and provide a network map. The network map displays relationships between the plurality of logical planes and those network elements associated with the plurality of logical planes. COSSINS does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, COSSINS does not disclose or suggest a processor that associates each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes. The Examiner relied on col. 10, lines 13-29, of COSSINS et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

Action, pg. 6). Applicants submit that this section of COSSINS does not disclose or suggest this feature of Applicants' claim 38.

At col. 10, lines 13-29, COSSINS et al. discloses:

As used herein, generating a map also can be construed to mean generating data and/or signaling to be used by the user browser 418 to display a map, depending on context. Likewise, generating geospatial data, network data, or geographic data also can be construed to mean generating data to be used by the user browser 418 to display the geospatial data, network data, or geographic data, depending on context. Similarly generating network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, or data thereof, display elements, or display characteristics also can be construed to mean generating data and/or signaling to be used by the user browser 418 to display the network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, or data thereof, display elements, or display characteristics, depending on context. Thus, generating any data also means generating data and/or signaling to be used by the user browser 418 to display the data or representations of the data, depending on context.

This section of COSSINS does not use the term "planes", does not use the term "logical", and thus does not use the phrase "logical planes". Applicants cannot find any language in this passage that could reasonably be construed as being synonymous to "logical planes" and respectfully requests that the Examiner please point to that language if this rejection is maintained and not withdrawn. Rather, this passage discloses that a browser 418 may use data and/or signaling to display geospatial data, network data, geographic data, network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, data or representations of the data. This section of COSSINS in no way discloses or suggests a processor that associates each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes.

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

Since COSSINS does not disclose a processor that associates each network element with one of a plurality of logical planes, COSSINS cannot disclose the processor providing a network map, where the network map displays relationships between the plurality of logical planes and those network elements associated with the plurality of logical planes. The Examiner relied on col. 10, lines 13-29, of COSSINS for disclosing this additional feature of Applicants' claim 38 (Office Action, pg. 6). As set forth above, this section of COSSINS et al. merely discloses that a browser 418 may use data and/or signaling to display geospatial data, network data, geographic data, network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, data or representations of the data. This section of COSSINS in no way discloses or suggests a processor providing a network map, where the network map displays relationships between the plurality of logical planes and those network elements associated with the plurality of logical planes, as required by claim 38.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 38 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 39-41 depend from claim 38. Therefore, these claims are allowable as well, for reasons based at least on their dependencies. Moreover, these claims recite features not disclosed by COSSINS.

For example, claim 39 recites that the plurality of logical planes includes one or more of a transmission plane, a switching plane, a customer access plane, and a signaling plane. The Examiner relied on col. 10, lines 21-24, of COSSINS for allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 6). Applicants respectfully disagree.

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

At col. 10, lines 21-27, COSSINS et al. discloses:

Similarly generating network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, or data thereof, display elements, or display characteristics also can be construed to mean generating data and/or signaling to be used by the user browser 418 to display the network elements, performance elements, geographic elements, or data thereof, display elements, or display characteristics, depending on context.

This section of COSSINS et al. in no way relates to the feature recited in Applicants' claim 39. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants once-again respectfully request that the Examiner explain how this section relates to the feature recited in Applicants' claim 39.

For at least this additional reason, Applicants submit that claim 39 is patentable over COSSINS.

Independent claims 43 and 48 recite features similar to features recited above with respect to claim 38. Therefore, Applicants submit that these claims are likewise patentable over COSSINS for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 38.

Claims 44-46 depend from claim 43. Therefore, these claims are likewise patentable over COSSINS for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 43.

Claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over WATSON in view of DEKONING. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 7 recites a system for managing a network. The system includes a user device configured to transmit a request for current network information, provide a first list of events occurring in the network via a graphical user interface, and

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

simultaneously provide a second list of events occurring in the network via the graphical user interface, the second list comprising a number of most recent events. The system further includes a server configured to receive the request for current network information and provide the current network information to the user device. WATSON and DEKONING, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, WATSON and DEKONING do not disclose or suggest a user device configured to provide a first list of events occurring in the network via a graphical user interface and simultaneously provide a second list of events occurring in the network via the graphical user interface, the second list comprising a number of most recent events. The Examiner admitted that WATSON does not disclose these features and Applicants agree. The Examiner relied on col. 5, lines 24-40, of DEKONING for allegedly disclosing providing a first list of events and col. 3, lines 13-15, and col. 6, lines 1-8, of DEKONING for allegedly disclosing providing a second list of events (Office Action, page 7). Applicants respectfully submit that these, or any other, sections of DEKONING do not disclose or suggest the providing features because DEKONING does not disclose or suggest a list or lists of events as Applicants have defined them; rather, DEKONING's lists are lists of network objects. A detailed explanation was provided hereinabove with respect to claim 1 on this very point, which is directly applicable here. Thus, the combination of WATSON and DEKONING does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 7.

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable over WATSON and DEKONING, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 8-11 depend from claim 7. Therefore, these claims are patentable over WATSON and DEKONING, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 7.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING et al. in view of BASS et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14. Applicants submit that the disclosure of BASS et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING et al. set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable over DEKONING and BASS, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING in view of BASS, and further in view of DOOLAN. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Applicants submit that the disclosure of DOOLAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of DEKONING and BASS set forth above with respect to claim 15. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over DEKONING, BASS, and DOOLAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 15.

Claims 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING in view of DOOLAN. Applicants respectfully traverse.

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

Claim 19 depends from claim 14. Applicants submit that the disclosure of DOOLAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 19 is patentable over DEKONING and DOOLAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20. Applicants submit that the disclosure of DOOLAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING set forth above with respect to claim 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 21 is patentable over DEKONING and DOOLAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 20.

Claims 17, 18, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING in view of BRANTON, JR. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 14. Applicants submit that the disclosure of BRANTON, JR. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 17 and 18 are patentable over DEKONING and BRANTON, JR., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 14.

Claim 22 depends from claim 20. Applicants submit that the disclosure of BRANTON, JR. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING set forth above with respect to claim 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 22 is

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

patentable over DEKONING and BRANTON, JR., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 20.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING in view of COSSINS. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 23 depends from claim 20. Applicants submit that the disclosure of COSSINS does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING set forth above with respect to claim 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 23 is patentable over DEKONING and COSSINS, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 20.

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DEKONING in view of COSSINS, and further in view of BRANTON, JR. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 25 depends from claim 24. Applicants submit that the disclosures of COSSINS and BRANTON, JR. do not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of DEKONING set forth above with respect to claim 24. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 25 is patentable over DEKONING, COSSINS, and BRANTON, JR., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 24.

Claims 27, 31, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over COSSINS in view of SITARAMAN. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 27 depends from claim 26. Applicants submit that the disclosure of SITARAMAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS set forth

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

above with respect to claim 26. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 27 is patentable over COSSINS and SITARAMAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 26.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30. Applicants submit that the disclosure of SITARAMAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS, set forth above with respect to claim 30. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over COSSINS, and SITARAMAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 30.

Claim 35 depends from claim 34. Applicants submit that the disclosure of SITARAMAN does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS set forth above with respect to claim 34. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 35 is patentable over COSSINS and SITARAMAN, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 34.

Claims 42, 47, 49, and 51-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over COSSINS in view of EICK. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 42 depends from claim 38. Applicants submit that the disclosure of EICK does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS set forth above with respect to claim 38. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 42 is patentable over COSSINS and EICK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 38.

Claim 47 depends from claim 43. Applicants submit that the disclosure of EICK does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of COSSINS set forth above with

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

respect to claim 43. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 47 is patentable over COSSINS and EICK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 43.

Independent claim 49 recites a system for managing a network having a plurality of network elements. The system includes a user device configured to provide a user with a list of network management options, where the options include a network element diagnostic option, a network summary option, a geographical network management option, and a three-dimensional network management option. The user device is further configured to transmit, in response to a selection of an option by the user, a request for current network information and provide the user with current network information according to the selected option. The system further includes a server configured to receive the request for current network information and transmit current network information to the user device. COSSINS and EICK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, COSSINS and EICK do not disclose a user device configured to provide a user with a list of network management options, where the options include a network element diagnostic option, a network summary option, a geographical network management option, and a three-dimensional network management option. The Examiner relied on col. 4, lines 18-22, of COSSINS for allegedly disclosing a network element diagnostic option and col. 11, lines 55-60, of COSSINS for allegedly disclosing a network summary option (Office Action, pg. 18). Applicants submit that these sections of COSSINS do not disclose or suggest a user device that provides a user with a list of

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

network management options, where the options include a network element diagnostic option and a network summary option.

At col. 4, lines 18-22, COSSINS discloses:

The GNMS 104 automatically creates customer defined "trouble areas" when a new trouble ticket is created within a specified range of a specified number of other trouble tickets. The range and the number can be defined by a user or pre-set. In addition, the GNMS 104 allows entry of an engineer defined or user defined trouble area.

This section of COSSINS discloses that a customer-defined trouble area can be created when a new trouble ticket is created. A trouble area is not a management option. A trouble ticket is not a management option. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, this section of COSSINS in no way discloses or suggests a user device that provides a user with a list of network management options, where the options include a network element diagnostic option, as required by Applicants' claim 29.

At col. 11, lines 55-60, COSSINS discloses:

A performance layer displays network elements with associated performance elements. This allows a user to view, for example, an alarm status of a network element and/or a performance status of the network element at the same time. Alternately, the performance layer can be configured to display only the performance elements.

This section of COSSINS discloses a performance layer that displays network elements and associated performance elements. A performance layer is not a management option. Network elements are not management options. Performance elements are not management options. An alarm status is not a management option. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, this section of COSSINS in no way discloses or suggests a user

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

device that provides a user with a list of network management options, where the options include a network summary option, as required by Applicants' claim 49.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 49 is patentable over COSSINS and EICK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 51-53 depend from claim 49. Therefore, these claims are patentable over COSSINS and EICK, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 49.

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over COSSINS in view of EICK, and further in view of DEKONING. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 50 depends from claim 49. Applicants submit that the disclosure of DEKONING does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosures of COSSINS and EICK set forth above with respect to claim 49. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 50 is patentable over COSSINS, EICK, and DEKONING, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 49.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT  
U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/702,303  
Attorney Docket No. 00-8008

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made amendments to certain claims and have presented arguments with respect to all claims which, in Applicants' view, should persuade the Examiner to allow all claims. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. No new matter is added by way of the amendments herein made. Applicants agree that the prior art made of record (in the office action of December 31, 2003) and which was not relied upon, should not have been relied upon. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 07-2347 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc.

By:

  
Joel Wall  
Reg. No. 25,648

Date: August 26, 2004

Customer No. 32127  
600 Hidden Ridge Drive  
Mail Code: HQE03H14  
Irving, Texas 75038  
(972) 718-4800